HON'BLE SHRI G.S.SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.16665 OF 2007

Between:

Smt. R.Usha Reddy

. . .Petitioner

AND

Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad and another

. . .Respondents

:: ORDER ::

Counsel for the petitioner : Shri V.Rajagopal Reddy

Counsel for the respondents : Smt. Kalpana Ekbote

7th August, 2007

-

PER G.S.SINGHVI, CJ

This petition filed for quashing notice dated 27.7.2007 issued by Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad (Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation) under Section 636 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955 for removal of the unauthorized construction made in premises bearing No. 6-3-873/1 situated near Rajeev Gandhi Statue, Somajiguda, Hyderabad is one of many such cases filed in this Court and the Civil Courts. There were times when the persons raising illegal and unauthorized constructions could get interim orders from Courts at different levels merely for asking, but the things have become quite difficult for them in last few years. The Courts have now realized that unwarranted judicial interference with the action initiated by the municipal authorities for ensuring planned development of the urban areas is becoming a cause of grave concern for the public.

We can, without hesitation of contradiction from any quarter, observe that entire citizenry of the twin cities is a victim of illegal and unauthorized constructions. Time and again, people have spoken about the traffic chaos in the city because, on account of illegal and unauthorized structures, vehicles are parked on the roads making it impossible for the public to use the facilities meant for them. It is high time that all the three organs of the State act in tandem to meet the menace of illegal and unauthorized constructions; else it may become impossible to live in the twin cities.

At the hearing, Shri V. Rajagopal Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner made a feeble attempt to convince us that the disputed

construction made in the area earmarked for parking has been regularized by the competent authority, but he could not produce any document in support of this assertion. Even the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition is conspicuously silent on this issue.

Faced with the dismissal of the writ petition, learned counsel made a request that his client may be permitted to withdraw the writ petition.

The request of the learned counsel is accepted and the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

As a sequel to dismissal of the main petition as withdrawn, WPMP No.21235 of 2007 filed by the petitioner for interim relief is disposed of as infructuous.

G.S.SINGHVI, CJ

7th August, 2007

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

kvni